

**AMENDMENTS TO THE SPECIFICATION**

**Please replace the paragraph bridging pages 45-46 with the following replacement paragraph:**

Batteries (h), (i), (j), (k) and (l) of the invention and comparative batteries (m) and (n) were prepared in the same manner as the batteries (a), (b), (c), (d) and (e) of the invention and the comparative batteries (f) and (g) of Example 5, respectively, except that as the positive active material there was used LiMn<sub>2</sub>O<sub>4</sub> instead of LiNiO<sub>2</sub>. In the batteries (a), (b), (e), (d) and (e) (h), (i), (j), (k) and (l) of the invention, the ratio of number of lithium atoms to number of oxygen atoms in lithium manganese spinel is 0.3, 0.35, 0.4, 0.45, and 0.5, respectively. In the comparative batteries (m) and (n), the ratio of number of lithium atoms to number of oxygen atoms in lithium manganese spinel is 0.25. The battery (m) comprises no metallic lithium foil laminated on the negative electrode while the battery (n) is assembled from a negative electrode laminated with a metallic lithium foil. These batteries had a designed capacity of about 600 mAh. These batteries were each then subjected to cycle life test under the same conditions as used in Example 5. The results are shown in Fig. 6. It can be seen from Fig. 6 that the batteries (h), (i), (j), (k) and (l) of the invention exhibit a remarkably excellent cycle life performance as compared with the comparative batteries (m) and (n). This is presumably because even when LiMn<sub>2</sub>O<sub>4</sub> is used as a positive active material, it gives the same principle as in the case of LiNiO<sub>2</sub>, making the batteries of the invention better than the comparative batteries in cycle life performance.